

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment claims 19-24 are added, and no claims are canceled or amended. As a result, claims 1-24 are now pending in the application. Support for the newly added claims can be found throughout the disclosure, for example, at paragraph [0029] and the various paragraphs of pages 12-13.

In the non-final Office Action of September 21, 2007, claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created obvious-type double patenting rejection in view of U.S. Patent 6,832,377 (Havemose '377). Claims 8-11 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of the paper entitled "Leveraging LDAP to Implement RBAC on the Web" (Bartz). Claims 1-7 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the Bartz paper.

Double Patent Rejection

A Terminal Disclaimer is being filed in conjunction with this paper. Therefore, withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is earnestly requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 Rejections in view of Bartz

The §102(b) rejection of claims 8-11 and 15-18 and the §103 of claims 1-7 and 12-14 in view of the Bartz paper are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Various embodiments of the present invention involve universal registration for an information appliance network. Conventional methods of registering users for access to

resources—for example, over the Internet—are often cumbersome and inefficient. In most instances, a new or unregistered user desiring to access a particular resource is required to enter personal information such as name, credit card number or other billing information. Various embodiments of the present invention overcome these inefficiencies for registering with a resource provider or other such server.

The Office cites the Bartz paper in the pending §102 and §103 rejection. However, the Bartz paper deals with authentication and authorization for providing access—Bartz does not pertain to *registration* as does the claimed invention. In other words, the Bartz system only confirms the identity of a previously registered user. By contrast, according to the specification of the present application, a user may enter registration information into a universal registration resource when utilizing a digital information appliance the first time or later when desiring to utilize charged content resources.”¹ Then, upon attempting to access a resource, “if the resource requires registration, the registration interface [e.g., DBO] may supply the needed information.”² This differs from the Bartz device which uses the X.509 certificate of a *previously registered user* to authenticate that user for subsequent access following their registration. For example, the following passage from Bartz demonstrates that the user must already be registered to use an X.509 certificate to gain access to a system:

The “X.509 ‘subject’ DN binds the authenticated identity (of the person who possesses and presents the certificate at run time) to an object in the directory which describes the person.”³

¹ Specification, paragraph [0029] sentence spanning pages 11-12.

² Specification, paragraph [0030].

³ Bartz, p. 70, col. 1, lines 40-43 (emphasis added).

The user (person) in Bartz has to already be registered with the system in order to gain access. If the user is not already registered, then how can the Bartz system maintain “an object in the directory which describes the person”? Furthermore, once a person has provided their initial registration information to register in the Bartz system (assuming the Bartz system requires initial registration), the Bartz system presumably does not use that registration information to authorize subsequent access, instead requiring an X.509 certificate for access after registration has been completed. Consequently, the Bartz paper does not disclose or suggest “wherein said provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said provider resource,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added), or “when said resource supports universal registration and said user is universally registered, obtaining registration information from a registration dynamic object,” as recited in claim 7 and claim 15.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Bartz paper does not disclose or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the pending rejections is respectfully requested.


Deposit Account Authorization / Provisional Time Extension Petition

It is believed that the petition for a one month extension of time is sufficient for this filing. However, to the extent necessary, a provisional petition for an additional extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0439 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, by telephone at (571)970-6835 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Charles Richardson

Reg. No. 43,436

The Brevetto Law Group, PLLC
107 S. West Street, #765, Alexandria, Virginia 22314
telephone: (571)970-6835

Date: January 22, 2008